

10/618,836

Remarks

In view of the foregoing amendments and these accompanying remarks, it is respectfully requested that this application be reconsidered.

Pursuant to the request of the Examiner, Pages 4 and 5 of the Specification were amended to remove the underlining.

The Abstract has been amended to delete use of the word "said" and to provide better punctuation. References to the number of claims and the drawings were also deleted.

Therefore, it is requested that the objections to the Specification and the Abstract be withdrawn.

Claim 1 has been canceled without prejudice and replaced by new Claim 3 in order to clarify the intended scope of the claims and to make the language more consistent with US practice. In so doing it is believed that the substance and scope of the claims has not been affected. In so doing it is believed that the rejections under 35 USC 112 have been obviated and it is requested that the rejections be withdrawn.

New Claim 4 is presented. This claim is the equivalent of original Claim 2, but written in independent form. Therefore, since the Examiner stated that Claim 2 contained allowable subject matter, it is respectfully requested that Claim 4 be allowed.

Applicant has considered the prior art rejections and respectfully disagrees with the Examiner.

As conceded by the Examiner, Oskarovich (RU Patent 2 145 396) does not disclose a buckle with two supports for the blocking device added to the latch.

Nanbu (US Patent 5,280,669) discloses a projection 41 on the rear end of the extended portion 11' of the latch 5 which, as shown in Figures 5a-5c, does not engage the locking member 6 at all. Therefore, the projection 41 is not the functional equivalent of the supports for the blocking member of the herein claimed invention.

10/618,836

Furthermore, neither reference discloses that "the supports for the blocking device and the front edges of the recesses of the symmetrical walls of the latch define a gap in between them, and the height of the supports for the blocking device is equal to or exceeding the depth of said recesses of the symmetrical walls of the latch." This too is a distinguishing feature of the instant claimed invention.

The invention addresses guaranteed opening of the buckle, e.g. in the car after a collision under the circumstances of buckle deformation, additional friction force or residual load, and does not address keeping the buckle closed under great acceleration forces as is done by Nanbu.

In Applicant's opinion the addition of two supports to the latch provides the buckle with a new and unique feature. It creates a new operative action for the device, which thereby creates a new result. The criteria of patentability is believed, therefore, to be present.

Therefore, the claims are novel over the cited prior art and not anticipated or obviated, and the rejection under 35 USC 103 should be withdrawn.

It is, therefore, requested that a Notice of Allowance issue and that all of the pending claims be allowed.

Dated: December 16, 2005

Respectfully submitted,
Lilling & Lilling P.C.
Customer No. 24101

By 

Bruce E. Lilling
(Reg. No. 27,656)
P.O. Box 560
Goldens Bridge, New York 10526
Phone (914) 684-0600
Facsimile (914) 684-0304
Bruce@Lilling.com